

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 6, which was rejected only based on Bao.

The reference to Bao is not relevant because the temperature ranges given in Bao do not constitute the recommended range formation. Instead, as indicated in the Abstract, the pyrolysis occurs at 900°C. It is believed that the office action refers to Figure 3, which is not how the material is made, but is just showing the results of the reaction along the course of the reaction at different temperatures. See page 399, last paragraph in the first column, going over to the second column. There is no suggestion that one should use any temperature below 800°C. And, certainly, the reference teaches using 900°C. The discussion on page 399 about temperature simply talks about the progress of the reaction, not the ultimate reaction that is utilized.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 12, indicated to be allowable, has been put into independent form as claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 and its dependent claims should be in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested. It calls for using a silicon source precursor comprising hydrazine ( $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ). This claim is rejected based on Todd, but Todd does not teach hydrazine.

The material cited at columns 27-31 is quite explicit that nothing of the form  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  is utilized and, in fact, the reference is even more explicit that hydrogen bonds are highly discouraged. For example, in paragraph 27, lines 3 and 4, it is stated that the compound is preferably substantially free of N-H bonds. To the same effect, is paragraph 30, which also says that the compound should contain less than about ten percent hydrogen atoms and, preferably, less than eight percent. There is nothing that suggests hydrazine is used in this reference and, therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Deferral of the double patenting rejection is again requested on the grounds that it is believed that the rejection is only preliminary, pending allowance of one of the cases. Only after the nature of the allowed claims, in one case, is known, can the double patenting rejection be positively addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 5, 2008



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation